| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| | 09/675,693 | ALCAZAR ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Sanjiv D. Shah | 2627 |
| All Participants: Status of Application: <u>rejected</u> | | |
| (1) <u>Sanjiv D. Shah</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) Michael K Colby. | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: <u>1 February 2006</u> | Time: <u>6:00 PM</u> | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: As applied in previous office action | | |
| Claims discussed: 23-37 | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: As applied in prior office action | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: Applicant's attorney authorized Examiner's amendment cancelling claims 23-37. | | |
| Part III. | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary | examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the | en summary of the substance interview, since the interview |
| | | |
| Aug 2 | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/ | Applicant's Representative Signature | nnature – if appropriate) |